IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.APPA RAO

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO. 6626 OF 2007

Dated : April 16, 2007

Between:

Smt. Koppolu Suguna

Petitioner

AND

The Station House Officer,
II Town Police Station,
Ongole, Prakasam District and another

Respondents

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.APPA RAO

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO. 6626 OF 2007

ORAL ORDER: **(per THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.APPA RAO)**

Heard the learned Government Pleader for Home, representing the learned Advocate General, appearing for the respondents.

2. This writ petition is taken up on the basis of a ‘telegram, dated 28.03.2007, sent by the petitioner alleging that her husband Koppolu Venkateswarlu was illegally detained by the Police II Town, Ongole, Prakasam District and she apprehends danger to the life of her husband.

3. Upon receipt of notices, issued by this Court, the Sub-Inspector of Police, II Town Police Station, Ongole, Prakasam District, filed counter-affidavit inter alia stating that the alleged detenue was never in illegally custody of the police. It is further stated that the alleged detenue was called to the Police Station on 27.3.2007 to ascertain the whereabouts of his son namely Rajesh and he was let off on the same day. It is also stated the alleged detenue was produced before the Tahsildar, Ongole on 02.04.2007 and he gave statement to the effect that he was never in illegal custody and was moving freely. Xerox copy of the statement is also enclosed to the counter. In view of the fact that the alleged detenue has given the statement before the Tahsildar to the effect that he was never in illegal custody and that he was moving freely, we do not

propose to continue the writ petition any longer. We also do not see any reason to suspect the statement recorded by the Competent Officer.

4. In view of the revelations made in the counter-affidavit, we do not find any merit in the allegations levelled in the telegram and consequently the writ petition fails and is liable to be dismissed.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed, at the stage of admission. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA

_____

JUSTICE D.APPA RAO

April 16, 2007
MAS